DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 300 437 TM 012 475

AUTHOR Moresi, Mereline; Lovelace, Terry
TITLE State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program, 1985-1986 Academic Year. Co-Teacher Program: Lafayette Parish School Board. Evaluation Report.
INSTITUTION Lafayette Parish School Board, La.
PUB DATE Jul 86
NOTE 34p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Basic Skills; *Compensatory Education; Elementary Education; Instructional Effectiveness; *Language Arts; *Mathematics Achievement; *Program Evaluation; Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Programs; Remedial Teachers; State Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Lafayette Parish Compensatory Remedial Program; *Louisiana Basic Skills Test

ABSTRACT

The Lafayette Parish Compensatory/Remedial Program for 1985-86 involved remedial teachers in 31 schools serving 1,022 students in grades 2 through 6 who had previously failed the state Basic Skills Test (BST). A minimum of 70 hours instruction was provided to the children in the area(s) in which each was deficient. Focus was on assessing the program's impact on student achievement in language arts and mathematics and the program's instructional effectiveness. Program effectiveness was evaluated largely through achievement data on the BST. Performance by these students on the BST in April 1986 was excellent, with 78% scoring above the minimum criterion (75% correct) in language arts and 86% scoring above the minimum in mathematics. The diagnostic/prescriptive model used in this program appeared effective in providing appropriate instruction. Remediation teachers should be encouraged to obtain certification as Reading Specialists to improve their methodology for diagnosing and remediating these children. Tables provide test results by grade for developmental and special education students. An application of the standards for evaluation to this program and budget information are appended. (SLD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED300437

Evaluation Report:

State-Funded Compensatory/Remedial Program
1985-1986 Academic Year

Co-Teacher Program
Lafayette Parish School Board
Lafayette, Louisiana

Dr. Wayne Vasher
Superintendent

Mrs. Mereline Moresi
Compensatory/Remedial
Program Coordinator

Dr. Terry Lovelace
Program Evaluator
Level A
Certificate Number 346

July, 1986

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mereline Moresi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

TM012475

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Executive Summary

The Lafayette Parish Compensatory/Remedial Program for the 1985-1986 school year involved remedial teachers in 31 schools serving 1,022 students enrolled in grade levels two through six who had previously failed the state Basic Skills Test (BST). This pull-out program provided a minimum of 70 hours of remedial assistance for each child in the area(s) in which the child was deficient. Evaluation questions included:

1) How did this program impact student achievement in language arts and mathematics?
2) How effective was the instruction provided to the students?

A summary of developmental students' achievement on the 1986 Basic Skills Test is presented in the following table:

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics
Second Grade	37 (86.0%) passed	35 (95.0%) passed
	5 (12.0%) failed	2 (5.0%) failed
Third Grade	46 (82.0)% passed	99 (91.0%) passed
	9 (16.0%) failed	6 (6.0%) failed
Fourth Grade	45 (68.0%) passed	97 (77.0%) passed
	17 (26.0%) failed	24 (19.0%) failed
Fifth Grade	41 (61.0%) passed	95 (74.0%) passed
	16 (24.0%) failed	22 (17.0%) failed

A summary of Special Education students' achievement on the 1986 Basic Skills Test is presented in the next table:

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics
Second Grade	9 (64.0%) passed	4 (50.0%) passed
	2 (14.0%) failed	3 (38.0%) failed
Third Grade	9 (43.0%) passed	13 (56.0%) passed
	10 (48.0%) failed	9 (39.0%) failed
Fourth Grade	8 (27.0%) passed	20 (63.0%) passed
	6 (20.0%) failed	8 (25.0%) failed
Fifth Grade	17 (29.0%) passed	17 (37.0%) passed
	33 (57.0%) failed	23 (50.0%) failed

Developmental students' achievement on the 1986 SRA Survey of Basic Skills is summarized by grade level and pre-post test performance (April 1985-April 1986) in the following table:

Grade Level	Reading (gle) (nce)			Mathematics (gle) (nce)		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Second	1.13	1.65	0.56	1.25	2.53	1.28
	15.88	24.39	8.51*	16.03	39.08	23.05*
Third	1.58	2.34	0.76	2.83	3.96	1.13
	20.68	27.66	6.98*	29.96	47.51	17.55*
Fourth	2.13	3.24	1.11	3.10	4.29	1.19
	24.08	29.89	5.81*	31.08	40.95	9.87*
Fifth	2.95	4.45	1.50	3.86	5.60	1.74
	28.71	36.47	7.76*	33.34	45.72	12.38*
Sixth	3.47	4.80	1.33	4.99	6.03	1.04
	32.13	30.91	-1.22	42.28	39.71	-2.57

*p<.01, Student's t-test

Results of Special Education students performance on the SRA Survey of Basic Skills are reported below:

Grade Level	Reading (gle) (nce)			Mathematics (gle) (nce)		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Second	0.98	1.70	0.72	1.27	1.90	0.63
	11.18	24.20	13.02*	9.83	28.67	18.84
Third	1.40	2.49	1.09	2.05	3.29	1.24
	17.18	27.50	10.32	2.05	3.29	1.24*
Fourth	1.81	2.84	1.03	2.94	3.97	1.03
	17.95	23.36	3.41	25.44	33.50	8.06
Fifth	2.25	3.96	1.71	3.07	4.55	1.48
	20.50	30.00	9.5	23.74	32.30	8.56
Sixth	2.75	4.35	1.60	3.82	4.80	0.98
	22.57	20.50	0.07	25.41	22.24	-3.17

*p<.01, Student's t-test

Had these pupils not received assistance from this program, they might have made minimal gains or fallen even futher behind in language arts and mathematics achievement. The gains made by these students demonstrate the successful impact of the program on academic achievement. However, remediation must continue to be provided for these students, or curriculum adjustments must be made in the classroom, in order for academic achievement to continue.

Table of Contents

	Page
Executive Summary	ii
Table of Content	v
Chapter One: Introduction	1
A. Program Rational	1
B. Description of the Program	3
C. Program Goals and Objectives	8
D. Evaluation Questions	9
Chapter Two: Methodology	11
A. Evaluation Design	11
B. Sampling Procedures	11
C. Instrumentation	11
D. Data Collection	12
E. Data Analyses Procedures	12
Chapter Three: Presentation of Data and Discussion of the Results	13
A. Data Presentation	13
B. Discussion of the Results	20
Chapter Four: Conclusions and Recommendations	23
A. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations	23
B. Impact Statement	23
Bibliography	24
Documentation	25
Budget	26

Chapter One: Introduction

A. Program Rational

Louisiana has, at present, the highest percentage of illiterate adults of any state in the nation. In order to combat illiteracy, the state legislature enacted Acts 621 and 750 which required the Louisiana State Department of Education to develop, administer, score, and report the results of a test measuring competency of minimum skills in language arts and mathematics. Students are now evaluated in second, third, fourth, and fifth grades on the state Basic Skills Test (BST). Those pupils who fail to correctly answer 75 percent of the questions on either the language arts or mathematics subtest must, by law, receive remediation.

During the regular school year, Lafayette Parish School Board utilizes the Co-teacher Program as the preferred compensatory/remedial plan for students who have failed the Basic Skills Test. Other remediation is offered during the summer school program. The Co-teacher Program format results from intensive research studies conducted in remedial reading and mathematics programs by the federal government and university-based investigators.

During the 1970's, the United States Office of Education mounted a major effort to find conclusive answers to the questions:

1) Which method of teaching reading produces the highest achievment?
2) What factors affect students' reading achievement?

Results of this classic study of the merits of 27 coordinated first grade studies indicate:

1) Systematic, sequential instruction based on a hierarchy of skills must be emphasized regardless of the approach to initial reading instruction;

2) Combinations of programs (defined as the **eclectic** approch) are often superior to single approaches;
3) Factors other than methodology influence pupil success, including qualities of the school system, the particular school building, the administrator, the teacher, the parents, and the student. These factors far outweigh differences in methodology in their influence on pupil achievement in language arts and mathematics;
4) To improve language arts and mathematics instruction, it is necessary to train better teachers rather than to expect a panacea in the form of materials.

The rational for the Lafayette Parish Compensatory/Remedial Program is based on Stauffer's summation of the findings of the First Grade Study (1967), combined with the Madeline Hunter Model of Education. Dr. Hunter states that good instruction is not a personality trait, but instead is a series of learned skills. The Hunter Model focuses on providing students with structured sequential instruction based on diagnosis of individual students' skills and learning styles. Carefully-designed lesson plans aid teachers in planning for all stages of learning, while motivation theory, retention, positive reinforcement, and appropriate rate and degree of learning are also emphasized.

Some researchers suggest that the learning problems facing many students result not so much from skill deficiencies as from students' negative attitudes toward learning. By helping poor students modify what they say to themselves about academic achievement, teachers may increase students' motivation, persistence, and expectancies of school success (Butkowsky and Willows, 1980; Doggett, 1979). In order to help learners experiencing difficulty mastering basic skills in language arts and mathematics, teachers must consider the factors affecting motivation, and then provide opportunities and incentives for learning, match interests with instructional materials, and structure the learning environment so that learning is both attractive and stimulating (Wlodkowski, 1978).

The Lafayette Parish Compensatory/Remedial Program focuses on both increasing academic achievement and developing a more positive academic self-concept in students who have failed the Basic Skills Test. Research results reported in the literature demonstrate a high correlation between these two factors (Goodacre, 1970).

Also, this program attempts to provide improved coordination between co-teachers, Chapter I and Special Education personnel, and classroom teachers. Parental involvement is incouraged, and every effort is made to match the student to appropriate materials and methodology.

B. Description of the Program

Student Eligibility. Pupils enrolled in grades two through six who failed the Louisiana Basic Skills Test in April, 1985, were eligible for this program. Compensatory/remedial instruction was provided by the co-teachers, Chapter I and Special Education personnel, and classroom teachers who tutored children outside the regular school day. A list of students participating in the program is available from Mrs. Mereline Moresi, K-3 Supervisor and Coordinator of the program.

Teacher Qualifications. Five co-teachers were employed by the program during the 1985-1986 school year, all of whom are certified by the State Department of Education Bureau of Teacher Certification. Certification as a Reading Specialist, while not required for employment, was strongly recommended. Continuing education, in the form of inservice programs and college courses, was provided to improve teachers' knowledge of instructional strategies and remediation theory. Other remedial teachers included Chapter I and Special Education personnel, along with several regular classroom teachers.

Teacher Caseload and Scheduling. Students eligible for the Compensatory/Remedial Program received a minimum of 70 hours remediation in mathematics and/or language arts. No more than 12 students were taught by a co-teacher during each instructional period.

The program had several instructional components, and children were scheduled appropriately for each:

1) summer school (466 children served);
2) academic year pull-out from regular classroom instruction (493 children served);
3) Special Education (273 children served);
4) Chapter I components (138 children served) ; and
5) tutorial services provided by regular classroom teachers before and after the regular school day (3 children served).

Of the children eligible for the program during the 1985-1986 school year, 70 students enrolled in Special Education classes were remediated during summer school. The remaining Special Education students were remediated during their regular IEP time units. Students eligible for Chapter I assistance were remediated in language arts skills during their instructional time in the Chapter I reading lab. Several students received compensatory/remedial instruction from two regular classroom teachers before and after the regular school day.

Schools involved in the Compensatory/Remedial Program during the 1985-1986 school year included:

Acadiana Middle School
L. J. Alleman Middle School
Alice Boucher Elementary School
Paul Breaux Middle School
Broadmoor Elementary School
Broussard Middle School
Carencro Middle School
Carencro Heights Elementary School
Katherine Drexel Elementary School
Duson Elementary School
Evangeline Elementary School
J. W. Faulk Elementary School
Judice Middle School
Lafayette Middle School
G. T. Lindon Elementary School

E. A. Martin Middle School
Milton Elementary School
S. J. Montgomery Elementary School
N. P. Moss Middle School
Myrtle Place Elementary School
Ossun Elementary School
Plantation Elementary School
Prairie Elementary School
Ridge Elementary School
St. Antoine Elementary School
Scott Middle School
Truman Elementary School
Vermilion Elementary School
Westside Elementary School
Woodvale Elementary School
Youngsville Elementary School

Instructional Methodology. Instruction provided by the co-teachers was based on students' needs as identified by the classroom teacher, co-teacher, or other professional educator. The Compensatory/Remedial Education Student Profile, provided by the Louisiana State Department of Education, was utilized by the various teachers as they planned individualized instructional programs for these pupils. Instruction focused on mastery of skills from the Basic Skills Test which had been determined to be areas of weakness last April. Instruction included (but was not limited to) the philosophy, methods, and materials included in the state-approved curriculum guides in language arts and mathematics. Other remedial methods and materials supplemented and reinforced methods and materials employed in the regular program. Teachers kept accurate records of individual students' progress as measured by formal and informal assessment instruments. Informal diagnostic tests were administered as needed by the remedial teachers.

Some methods of choice included in the program are listed below:

Language Experience Approach to Reading;
Phonics;
Structured drill on basic sight word vocabulary;

Programmed materials;
The Fernald Technique (VAKT);
Neurological Impress to Automaticity;
Mathematic manipulatives;
Learning centers in language arts and mathematics.

Methodology was chosen based on individual students' learning styles and interests. Remedial teachers and regular classroom teachers previewed the reading, mathematics, and composition curriculae provided in Bulletins 1488, 1497, and 1502, respectively. Using formal and informal assessment, including skill profiles from the Basic Skills Test and the SRA Achievement Test and results of criterion-referenced and teacher-made tests, instructors determined their pupils' appropriate learning levels, conducted indepth diagnosis of individual skill deficiencies, and applied prescriptive instruction. Emphasis was placed on transfer of new skills to real-life situations. All instruction was designed to augument regular classroom instruction. Record keeping demonstrated both individual and group mastery of specified skills.

Instructional Materials. A list of materials provided to each remedial teacher follows:

Addison Wesley Mathematics Skill Seekers
Barnell Loft Specific Skills Series
DEMI's Minimum Standards Workbooks
Edu-Tronics Math Management System
Edu-Tronics Envelope Games
Hoffman Comprehension and Decoding Kits
Macmillan Reading Series r
Macmillan Mathematics Series
SRA Reading for Understanding

Since this program emphasized the diagnostic/prescriptive approach, each teacher tailored a special program for each child. She selected appropriate methodology and materials to match the individual programs. The Lafayette Parish Co-teacher Program acknowledges a teacher variable in instruction. Since teaching styles vary considerable,

each remedial teacher was allowed to use those materials and methods she deemed appropriate for the children she was teaching.

Student Assessment. The Lafayettte Parish school system has developed, as part of the Pupil Progression Plan, mastery criteria based in part on the Louisina State Minimum Standards which appear in Bulletins 1488, 1497, and 1502. These mastery criteria were used in determining the extent of student achievment in basic language arts and mathematics skills in which students enrolled in the program were deficient.

Students were assessed in several ways to determine mastery of basic skills:

1) Criterion-referenced tests (CRT's) were administered to pupils enrolled in the program during the regular school year. Two tests, developed by the CENLA Professional Development Center, following the same test item format, assessing the same skills, were administered in late November and late May.
2) Mastery tests from the Macmillan reading and mathematics series were administered by the classroom teachers and shared with the remediation teachers.
3) The appropriate level of the SRA Survey of Basic Skills was administered by the classroom teachers in April, 1986.
4) The appropriate level of the state Basic Skills Test was administered by the classroom teachers in April, 1986.

Coordination with Other Programs. Remediation teachers worked closely with the pupils' regular classroom teachers to coordinate the students' instructional programs. Test results were shared, as well as student progress reports. Inservice programs conducted by the program coordinator stressed the importance of coordinating remedial and regular classroom instruction. Regular classroom teachers reported to parents and conferred with remedial teachers frequently.

To assure program coordination, inservice education programs were held in August, 1985, to educate remedial teachers about the program, including suggested remedial techniques and approved

recordkeeping procedures. Program goals and objectives were delineated. Monthly meetings were held during the academic year with the co-teachers and program coordinator. Periodic inservice sessions were also scheduled for all remedial teachers to ensure that the children who were not progressing satisfactorily could be identified so that appropriate steps could be taken to correct their problems.

Coordination of Curriculum. The remedial teachers contacted the regular classroom teachers during September to present a copy of the student profile for each pupil from the previous administration of the BST. If requested, remedial teachers shared diagnostic/prescriptive methodology with the regular classroom teachers and informed them of students' problem areas. Remedial teachers met on a regular basis with regular classroom teachers to describe the remediation program, share reports of student progress, and coordinate instructional programs.

Other Program Coordination. Special Education programs lent support by continuing to teach those children previously identified as exceptional pupils, and by sharing the resources of pupil appraisal personnel assigned to the Lafayette Parish School Board (school psychologists, social workers, and educational strategists).

The Chapter I Program in Lafayette Parish uses reading labs and a pull-out program at the elementary level, with additional elective classes at the secondary level. Counseling and guidance personnel and psychometrists were also available for students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program, through the services offered by Chapter I.

Lafayette Parish School Board also hired 15 guidance counselors who worked in the schools, assisting remedial teachers as they attempted to improve students' academic self-esteem and increase academic motivation.

C. Program Goals and Objectives

The purpose of the Lafayette Parish Compensatory/Remedial Program is the improvement of students' academic achievement in language arts and mathematics skills. Beyond this primary goal,

secondary goals include increasing students' academic self-concept, preventing alienation from school, and preventing early departure from school. Specific program objectives included:

1) increase academic achievement in language arts and mathematics as measured by the SRA Survey of Basic Skills;
2) successful completion of the state Basic Skills Test;
3) mastery of basic skills as measured by CRT's;
4) coordination between regular classroom instruction and remedial instruction;
5) evaluation of instruction provided by the co-teachers; and
6) evaluation of the Compensatory/Remedial Program by the co-teachers.

D. Evaluation Questions

Two evaluation questions were addressed:

1) Did the Lafayette Parish Compensatory/Remedial Program accomplish the objectives listed above?
2) What impact did the evaluation have on the program for the 1986-1987 school year?

E. Identification of Audiences

Audiences identified as either essential for the functioning of the program or as audiences for dissemination of the evaluation report included:

1) Lafayette Parish School Board Superintendent Dr. Wayne Vasher;
2) members of the Lafayette Parish School Board;
3) the program coordinator, Mrs. Mereline Moresi, and other central office personnel;
4) directors and personnel from other programs, including Special Education and Chapter 1;
5) the co-teachers;
6) administrators and classroom teachers whose students were involved in the program;

7) parents of children enrolled in the program; and
8) students enrolled in the program.

Chapter Two: Methodology

A. Evaluation Design

The purposes of this evaluation are to meet the requirements of the Lafayette Parish School Board, to measure the effectiveness of the program in terms of students' academic achievement, and to determine the effectiveness of the program in terms of positive opinions of remedial teachers involved in the program.

The evaluation design is a pre-test, post-test design with intervention in the form of compensatory/remedial instruction provided by the remedial teachers.

B. Sampling Procedures

Students who did not meet the minimum performance standards as measured by the Louisiana Basic Skills Test in language arts and/or mathematics (established in the Literacy Assessment Program) received compensatory/remedial instruction.

The Lafayette Parish School Board has established a systematic procedure for identifying students eligible for this program. A list of the students who did not meet mastery criterion on specific subtests of the state minimum competency test is available from the program coordinator. The list is organized by eligible students enrolled in elementary and middle schools in Lafayette Parish. Each school administrator has a copy of this list on file. All students eligible for the program were served by co-teachers, Chapter 1 teachers, Special Education teachers, or regular classroom teachers who remediated students before or after the regular school day.

C. Instrumentation

Scores from the following instruments were collected for use in data analyses designed to answer the evaluation questions:

1) Louisiana Basic Skills Test (scores expressed as percent of responses correct on language arts and mathematics subtests);
2) SRA Survey of Basic Skills (scores expressed in grade level and normal curve equivalencies);
3) CRT scores from November and May testings (scores expressed in terms of skills mastered);
4) Written evaluations of the program by remediation teachers.

D. Data Collection

The Louisiana Basic Skills Test and SRA Survey of Basic Skills were administered by the regular classroom teachers. Sixth grade students did not take the BST, since no form exists at present at the sixth grade level. The BST was scored by National Computer Systems, Iowa City, Iowa, while the SRA was scored by Science Research Associates in Chicago, Illinois. The remediation teachers collected these test scores, along with information on pupils' mastery of skills as measured by CRT's.

E. Data Analyses Procedures

Data were analyzed using the StatWorks software package for the Macintosh computer.

Chapter Three: Presentation of the Data and Discussion of the Results

A. Data Presentation

In the following section of this evaluation report, objectives and results of data analyses are presented.

Objective 1. During the 1985-1986 school year, 70% of the developmental second and third grade students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program will achieve six month's gain in grade level equivalency scores upon completion of nine month's instruction in language arts and/or mathematics, as measured by the SRA Survey of Basic Skills (pretest, April 1985; posttest, April 1986).

Developmental students' achievement on the 1986 SRA Survey of Basic Skills is summarized by grade level and pre-post test performance (April 1985-April 1986) in the following table:

Grade Level	Reading (gle) (nce)			Mathematics (gle) (nce)		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Second	1.13	1.65	0.56	1.25	2.53	1.28
	15.88	24.39	8.51*	16.03	39.08	23.05*
Third	1.58	2.34	0.76	2.83	3.96	1.13
	20.68	27.66	6.98*	29.96	47.51	17.55*

*p<.01, Student's t-test

The number and percentage of developmental students reaching the goal of achieving 0.60 or higher gle gain in reading and mathematics have been tabulated and are reported in the following table:

Grade	Reading			Mathematics		
	Total Number	Met Goal	Percent Who Met Goal	Total Number	Met Goal	Percent Who Met Goal
Second	44	21	48.0%	37	25	68.0%
Third	56	31	55.0%	109	76	70.0%

Results of Special Education students performance on the SRA Survey of Basic Skills are reported below:

Grade Level	Reading (gle) (nce)			Mathematics (gle) (nce)		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Second	0.98	1.70	0.72	1.27	1.90	0.63
	11.18	24.20	13.02*	9.83	28.67	18.84
Third	1.40	2.49	1.09	2.05	3.29	1.24
	17.18	27.50	10.32	2.05	3.29	1.24*

Objective 2. During the 1985-1986 school year, 70% of the developmental fourth, fifth, and sixth grade students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program will achieve six month's gain in mathematics and four month's gain in reading in terms of grade level equivalency scores obtained from the SRA Survey of Basic Skills (pretest, April 1985; posttest, April 1986).

Developmental students' achievement on the 1986 SRA Survey of Basic Skills is summarized by grade level and pre-post test performance (April 1985-April 1986) in the following table:

Grade Level	Reading (gle) (nce)			Mathematics (gle) (nce)		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Fourth	2.13	3.24	1.11	3.10	4.29	1.1
	24.08	29.89	5.81*	31.08	40.95	9.87*
Fifth	2.95	4.45	1.50	3.86	5.60	1.74
	28.71	36.47	7.76*	33.34	45.72	12.38*
Sixth	3.47	4.80	1.33	4.99	6.03	1.04
	32.13	30.91	-1.22	42.28	39.71	-2.57

*p<.01, Student's t-test

The number and percentage of developmental students reaching the goal of achieving 0.40 or higher gle gain in reading and 0.60 or higher gle gain in mathematics have been tabulated:

	Reading			Mathematics		
Grade	Total Number	Met Goal	Percent Who Met Goal	Total Number	Met Goal	Percent Who Met Goal
Fourth	66	53	80.0%	126	92	73.0%
Fifth	67	45	67.0%	127	107	84.0%
Sixth	77	57	74.0%	95	59	62.0%

Results of Special Education students performance on the SRA Survey of Basic Skills are reported below:

Grade Level	Reading (gle) (nce)			Mathematics (gle) (nce)		
	Pre	Post	Gain	Pre	Post	Gain
Fourth	1.81	2.84	1.03	2.94	3.97	1.0
	17.95	23.36	3.41	25.44	33.50	8.06
Fifth	2.25	3.96	1.71	3.07	4.55	1.48
	20.50	30.00	9.50	23.74	32.30	8.56
Sixth	2.75	4.35	1.60	3.82	4.80	0.98
	22.57	20.50	0.07	25.41	22.24	-3.17

*p<.01, Student's t-test

Objective 3. During the 1985-1986 school year, 75% of second and third grade students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program will score 75% or above on the Louisiana Basic Skills Test in language arts and mathematics.

A summary of developmental students' achievement on the 1986 Basic Skills Test is presented in the following table:

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics
Second Grade	37 (86.0%) passed	35 (95.0%) passed
	5 (12.0%) failed	2 (5.0%) failed
Third Grade	46 (82.0)% passed	99 (91.0%) passed
	9 (16.0%) failed	6 (6.0%) failed

A summary of Special Education students' achievement on the 1986 Basic Skills Test is presented in the next table:

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics
Second Grade	9 (64.0%) passed	4 (50.0%) passed
	2 (14.0%) failed	3 (38.0%) failed

Third Grade	9 (43.0%) passed	13 (56.0%) passed
	10 (48.0%) failed	9 (39.0%) failed

Objective 4. Sixty percent of the fourth and fifth grade students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program will score 75% or above on the Louisiana Basic Skills Test in language arts and mathematics.

A summary of developmental students' achievement on the 1986 Basic Skills Test is presented in the following table:

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics
Fourth Grade	45 (68.0%) passed	97 (77.0%) passed
	17 (26.0%) failed	24 (19.0%) failed
Fifth Grade	41 (61.0%) passed	95 (74.0%) passed
	16 (24.0%) failed	22 (17.0%) failed

A summary of Special Education students' achievement on the 1986 Basic Skills Test is presented in the next table:

Grade Level	Language Arts	Mathematics
Fourth Grade	8 (27.0%) passed	20 (63.0%) passed
	6 (20.0%) failed	8 (25.0%) failed
Fifth Grade	17 (29.0%) passed	17 (37.0%) passed
	33 (57.0%) failed	23 (50.0%) failed

Objective 5. During the 1985-1986 school year, the program evaluator will collect data concerning the coordination between the Compensatory/Remedial Program, Chapter I, Special Education, and regular classroom instruction. Data will be collected via direct observation and structured interviews, and will be reported in case study format. Coordination between the State Department of Education Bureau of Research and Evaluation and the program evaluator will be documented, in order to facilitate data collection and analyses.

Due to loss of staff in the State Department of Education Bureau of Research and Evaluation, which resulted in State Department of Education personnel being unexpectedly reassigned to other projects, case studies were eliminated. However, the local project evaluator informally queried the remediation teachers (co-teachers, Chapter I, and Special Education teachers) about their interactions with the regular classroom teachers. Also, the project evaluator interviewed classroom teachers at several schools about program coordination. The remediation teachers appeared to work closely with the regular classroom teachers. Several teachers commented that the curriculum handbooks provided by Lafayette Parish School Board and the State Department of Education were helpful in coordination of instruction and curriculum. Perhaps the best evidence of coordination is the number of deficient skills mastered by the students enrolled in the program:

Math Skill Deficiencies Mastered (1985-1986)

	Special Education	Co-teachers
Number of deficiences	1,744	3,073
Skills mastered, first CRT	480	1,328
Skills mastered, second CRt	729	1,179
Total skills mastered	1,209	2,507

Language Arts Skill Deficiencies Mastered

	Special Education	Chapter I	Co-teachers
Number of deficiencies	1,808	1,172	540
Skills mastered, first CRT	835	638	276
Skills mastered second CRT	729	372	131
Total skills mastered	1,564	1,010	307

Objective 6. During the 1985-1986 school year, the co-teachers employed in the Compensatory/Remedial Program will be observed and evaluated by Mrs. Mereline Moresi, program coordinator, to determine teacher effectiveness.

During the 1985-1986 academic year, Mrs. Moresi monitored students' progress in terms of skills mastered in order to determine the pace of instruction and teacher effectiveness. She observed the teachers on a regular basis; these observations are documentated and are filed at the Lafayette Parish School Board office. Co-teachers contacted Mrs. Moresi frequently during the year, in addition to regularly-scheduled inservice meetings. Direct observation of the co-teachers indicated that the diagnostic/prescriptive approach as utilized by the co-teachers is an effective means of providing for individual students' needs.

Objective 7. Co-teachers will evaluate the Compensatory/Remedial Program anonymously by responding to an open-ended questionnaire prepared by the program evaluator and program coordinator.

Co-teachers evaluated the program anonymously in writing during an inservice program in May. In general, the co-teachers support the program, and view their teaching experiences positively. Due to the large number of students served in the summer school program, only five co-teachers were employed this year, instead of seven. Co-teachers were assigned to students in as many as seven schools, and were unable to remediate their students on a daily basis. They felt that, ideally, they should remediate their students on a daily basis for an hour each day.

The co-teachers are aware that, due to state cuts in funding, the Compensatory/Remedial Program may be eliminated next year. One teacher suggested: "If the current program is not to be continued, I would suggest fulltime remediation classrooms, staffed by teachers who have proven skills in working with students in need of remediation. The class size would be limited to 15 pupils (I know--dream on!). But remediation students need more than just academic remediation; teachers need to address self esteem, learning styles, individualized instruction, etc. The current notion of before/after school remediation

combined with Saturday morning instruction just does not seem feasible to me."

One teacher commented on the difficulty of scheduling middle school students who failed the fifth grade level BST last year, and were enrolled in sixth grade this year. She suggests that compensatory/remedial students should receive priority scheduling. Students were pulled out of social studies and science. "My students were always complaining about their poor grades in these subjects, yet they like the assistance that I give them." This co-teacher felt counselors needed to know sooner which pupils will be enrolled in compensatory/remediation education, so that pupils can be pulled out of physical education instead of a content course.

Comments from Special Education and Chapter 1 teachers were positive and supportive, with several teachers commenting at length on the high quality of materials and supervision provided. Many teachers expressed concern about the placement of these students during the next academic year if the Compensatory/Remedial Program is terminated by the state legislature. Teacher suggestions for the next year included hiring co-teachers to conduct remediation of all students eligible for compensatory/remedial instruction, forming remedial classes with a pupil-teacher ratio of 15-1, and developing alternative education programs at a lower grade level. Also, these remedial teachers feel strongly that parental involvement, commitment, and accountability should be emphasized in the program, since the degree of support provided by the home influences students' academic achievement. In addition, Special Education and Chapter 1 teachers praised the co-teachers assigned to their schools who provided a great deal of support and professional assistance in instructional methodology, guidance, and scheduling.

B. Discussion of Results

Objective 1. While normal curve equivalent (nce) gains were statistically significant for second and third grade developmental students in reading and mathematics, only in mathematics did 70 percent or more of the students gain six months or more in grade level equivalencies (gle's). Sixty-eight percent of the second grade pupils and 70 percent of the third grade students met this goal. Special

Education students, as was expected, did not meet this objective; if they were capable of making these kinds of achievement gains, they would not be eligible for Special Education services.

Objective 2. Statistically-significant gains were noted in reading and mathematics for fourth and fifth grade developmental students. Negative gains were noted in both reading and mathematics for sixth grade developmental students. Eighty percent of the fourth grade pupils and 67 percent of the fifth grade pupils gained 0.4 months gie, while 74 percent of the sixth grade students met this goal. Over 70 percent of the fourth and fifth grade developmental students gained 0.6 months gie in mathematics, while only 62 percent of the sixth grade students made an average gain of 0.6 months gie in mathematics. Again, none of the Special Education students met Objective 2.

Objective 3. Second and third grade developmental students who received compensatory/remedial instruction scored, on the average, 75 percent or above on the Basic Skills Test. Only 14 students failed to meet the minimum criterion of 75 percent correct on the language arts subtest, while only 8 failed the mathematics subtest. Many of the Special Education students were not required to take the Basic Skills Test. Since so few children were involved in the assessment, analysis of their scores would be meaningless, unless individual scores are examined to determine skill proficiency for instructional purposes.

Objective 4. Fourth and fifth grade level developmental students met this objective in language arts and mathematics. Twenty of 28 Special Education students participating in the program at the fourth grade level met this objective. No other Special Education students met this objective.

Objective 5. Coordination between the Compensatory/Remedial Program, Chapter I, Special Education, and regular classroom instruction was observed by the program coordinator and the project evaluator. The high percentage of skills mastered by students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program is evidence supporting this observation.

Objective 6. Mrs. Mereline Moresi, program coordinator and supervisor, evaluated the co-teachers to determine their effectiveness.

Evaluation and observation records are on file at the Lafayette Parish School Board. The instructional model, methodology, and materials employed in the program appear to be effective in terms of students' achievement as measured by the assessment instruments used in this evaluation.

Objective 7. Co-teachers and all other remediation teachers (Chapter I, Special Education, regular classroom teachers tutoring before/after the regular school day) evaluated the program. Scheduling students at so many schools with so few co-teachers appears to be a difficult task, and the co-teachers sometimes wish for a more ideal schedule, particularly in regard to teaching classes where language arts and mathematics students are grouped together. The positive comments from Special Education and Chapter I teachers reveal their support of the program. Almost every evaluation from remediation teachers (excluding co-teachers) included a plea for hiring additional co-teachers.

Chapter Four: Conclusions and Recommendations

A. Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

1. Reading and other language arts skills are more difficult for students enrolled in the Compensatory/Remedial Program to learn, as evidenced by the scores on the assessment instruments employed to measure achievement in this evaluation. However, developmental students' performance on the Basic Skills Test was excellent, with 78 percent of the students scoring above the minimum criterion (75 percent correct) in language arts, and 86 percent of the students scoring above the minimum criterion in mathematics. Since reading and other language arts skills are apparently more difficult for these children to learn, remediation teachers should be encouraged to obtain certification as Reading Specialists in order to learn appropriate methodology for diagnosing and remediating these children.

2. The diagnotistic/prescriptive model utilized in this program appears to be an effective means of providing appropriate instruction to students enrolled in the program. The remediation teachers involved in this program are to be commended for their superior instruction, cooperation with the program coordinator and evaluator, and professional attitude.

B. Impact Statement

The coordinator and remediation teachers involved in this program were pleased to learn of its overall success. A copy of this evaluation was presented to Dr. Wayne Vasher, Superintendent of Lafayette Parish Schools. At this time, the severe economic recession in Louisiana may result in termination of this program by the Louisiana legislature due to lack of funds. However, should the program continue, the results of this evaluation will be considered in planning next year's program.

Bibliography

Bond, G. L., & Dykstra, R. The cooperative research program in first-grade reading instruction. Reading Research Quarterly, Summer, 1967, 2, 4-142.

Butkowsky, I. S., & Willows, D. M. Cognitive motivational characteristics of children varying in reading ability: Evidence for learned helplessness in poor readers. Journal of Educational Psychology, 1980, 72, 408-422.

Doggett, M. Aiding the moderately deficient reader at the secondary level. Kappa Delta Pi Record, 1979, 16, 54-57.

Goodacre, E. Reading research in Great Britain--1979. Reading, 1980, 14, 3-11.

Stauffer, R. G. (Ed.) The first grade reading studies: Findings of individual investigations. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, 1967.

Wlodkowski, R. Motivation and teaching, A practical guide. Washington, D. C.: National Association of Education, 1978.

Documentation

Citation Form*

The *Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials* guided the development of this (check one):

request for evaluation plan/design/proposal
evaluation plan/design/proposal
evaluation contract
evaluation report
other

To interpret the information provided on this form, the reader needs to refer to the full text of the standards as they appear in Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, *Standards for Evaluations of Educational Programs, Projects, and Materials*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1980

The *Standards* were consulted and used as indicated in the table below (check as appropriate):

Descriptor		The Standard was deemed applicable and to the extent feasible was taken into account	The Standard was deemed applicable but could not be taken into account	The Standard was not deemed applicable	Exception was taken to the Standard
A1	Audience Identification	p. 9			
A2	Evaluator Credibility	1			
A3	Information Scope and Selection	p. 10-11			
A4	Valuational Interpretation	p. 22			
A5	Report Clarity	p. 1-26			
A6	Report Dissemination	p. 9			
A7	Report Timeliness	p. 22			
A8	Evaluation Impact	p. 22			
B1	Practical Procedures	p. 22			
B2	Political Viability	p. 22			
B3	Cost Effectiveness	p. 27			
C1	Formal Obligation	p. 1-2			
C2	Conflict of Interest			X	
C3	Full and Frank Disclosure	p. 1-27			
C4	Public's Right to Know	p. 9			
C5	Rights of Human Subjects	p. 1-22			
C6	Human Interactions			X	
C7	Balanced Reporting	p. 1-22			
C8	Fiscal Responsibility	p. 26-27			
D1	Object Identification	p. 1-22			
D2	Context Analysis	p. 1-22			
D3	Described Purposes and Procedures	p. 10-11			
D4	Defensible Information Sources	p. 10-11			
D5	Valid Measurement	p. 10-11			
D6	Reliable Measurement	p. 10-11			
D7	Systematic Data Control	p. 11			
D8	Analysis of Quantitative Information	p. 12-20			
D9	Analysis of Qualitative Information	p. 12-20			
D10	Justified Conclusions	p. 22			
D11	Objective Reporting	p. 1-27			

Name: Terry Lovelace (typed) Terry Lovelace (signature) Date: 6/25/86

Position or Title: Program Evaluator

Agency: Lafayette Parish School Board

Address: P.O. Box 40053, Lafayette, La. 70504

Relation to Document: Author
(e.g., author of document, evaluation team leader, external auditor, internal auditor)

*The Publisher gives permission to photocopy this form.

Budget

MANDATORY

FINAL BUDGET REPORT

1985-86 STATE-FUNDED COMPENSATORY/REMEDIAL PROGRAM REGULAR YEAR BUDGET

Please complete this form for your 1985-86 regular year program. If any changes were made in any budget category in excess of 10% of the amount originally budgeted, please attach an explanation of the changes. Return this form to Dr. William A. Davis, Bureau of Elementary Education, State Department of Education by July 15, 1986. If you have any questions, please call (504) 342-3366.

School System: Lafayette Parish Contact Person: Mereline Moresi

Superintendent's Signature _____

Number of Units Taught in Regular Year Program:	
By Comp Ed Teachers	355
By Chapter I	138
TOTAL Regular Year Units	493

CATEGORY	AMOUNT
Teacher Salaries	$111,357.60
Teacher Benefits	11,419.36
Materials and Supplies	12,325.00
Instructional Equipment	3,430.42
Teacher Travel	1,595.43
Student Transportation	-0-
Chapter I Reimbursement	11,005.50
Staff Development	2,780.75
Administrative Costs	8,002.11
Other Costs	2,000.00
TOTAL REGULAR YEAR BUDGET	$163,916.17